

I wish I could give you some good sense of where we are with all of that. As you know, these discussions are taking place. The rules are a little bit different with the Senate than they are with us. We've done our work here on the House side. I would hope that those conference committees will get ready real soon. I'm sure that we'll take them up as soon as they are ready, and I hope that will be very soon. I have no sense as to when that will be. I'm very hopeful, like you are, I'm sure, that it will all be between now and November 16.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's view on that. I am hopeful. I think we've got a handful of bills that have been approved now by both the House and the Senate, bills reported over to the House from the Senate; and my view is that we're beyond the time when we should have been reaching some conclusions on these bills, and urge the majority to work with the minority and find a way to get these bills done.

I think in the Mil Qual Veterans area there was a substantial increase. There's been an increase every year for the last dozen years. But a substantial increase to the tune of like \$18.5 million a day in benefits to veterans and military families; and every day we let that go by just complicates the delivery of those services. And I hope we can move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2007

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CLAY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON AP- PROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Greg Lankler, Staff Assistant, Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, October 18, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am submitting this letter pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. On October 11, 2007, I received a grand jury subpoena issued by the U.S. District Court for the Central District for California. After consulting with the Office of General Counsel, and based on the information currently available to me, I have determined that the ad testificandum aspect of that subpoena is not consistent with the rights and privileges of the House, and the duces tecum aspect of the subpoena seeks records that are not material and relevant.

Sincerely,

GREG LANKLER,
Staff Assistant.

INTERNET GAMBLING REGULA- TION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2007

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter a letter cowritten by my Maryland Attorney General which raises concerns about the impact that the Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007 would have on the power of the States to make and enforce their own gambling laws. In my view, the letter raises questions that merit the consideration of my colleagues.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2007.

DEAR CHAIRMAN FRANK AND RANKING MEMBER BACHUS: We, the Attorneys General of our respective States, have grave concerns about H.R. 2046, the "Internet Gambling Regulation and Enforcement Act of 2007." We believe that the bill would undermine States' traditional powers to make and enforce their own gambling laws.

On March 21, 2006, 49 NAAG members wrote to the leadership of Congress:

"We encourage the United States Congress to help combat the skirting of state gambling regulations by enacting legislation which would address Internet gambling, while at the same time ensuring that the authority to set overall gambling regulations and policy remains where it has traditionally been most effective: at the state level."

Congress responded by enacting the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 (UIGEA), which has effectively driven many illicit gambling operators from the American marketplace.

But now, less than a year later, H.R. 2046 proposes to do the opposite, by replacing state regulations with a federal licensing program that would permit Internet gambling companies to do business with U.S. customers. The Department of the Treasury would alone decide who would receive federal licenses and whether the licensees were complying with their terms. This would represent the first time in history that the federal government would be responsible for issuing gambling licenses.

A federal license would supersede any state enforcement action, because §5387 in H.R. 2046 would grant an affirmative defense against prosecution or enforcement action under and Federal or State law to any person who possesses a valid license and

complies with the requirements of H.R. 2046. This divestment of state gambling enforcement power is sweeping and unprecedented.

The bill would legalize Internet gambling in each State, unless the Governor clearly specifies existing state restrictions barring Internet gambling in whole or in part. On that basis, a State may "opt out" of legalization for all Internet gambling or certain types of gambling. However, the opt-out for types of gambling does not clearly preserve the right of States to place conditions on legal types of gambling. Thus, for example, if the State permits poker in licensed card rooms, but only between 10 a.m. and midnight, and the amount wagered cannot exceed \$100 per day and the participants must be 21 or older, the federal law might nevertheless allow 18-year-olds in that State to wager much larger amounts on poker around the clock.

Furthermore, the opt-outs may prove illusory. They will likely be challenged before the World Trade Organization. The World Trade Organization has already shown itself to be hostile to U.S. restrictions on Internet gambling. If it strikes down state opt-outs as unduly restrictive of trade, the way will be open to the greatest expansion of legalized gambling in American history and near total preemption of State laws restricting Internet gambling.

H.R. 2046 effectively nationalizes America's gambling laws on the Internet, "harmonizing" the law for the benefit of foreign gambling operations that were defying our laws for years, at least until UIGEA was enacted. We therefore oppose this proposal, and any other proposal that hinders the right of States to prohibit or regulate gambling by their residents.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS GANSLER,
Attorney General of Maryland.
BILL MCCOLLUM,
Attorney General of Florida.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 106

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor on House Resolution 106.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE OF RON PRESCOTT

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Los Angeles Unified School District in California lost one of its most prestigious leaders. Ron Prescott died a week ago, and for over 30 years he represented the district in Sacramento, California, the capital.

Ron Prescott, over the years, was voted one of the top lobbyists for children. He was charismatic, he was diplomatic, but most of all, he was dedicated to the children of our State, and particularly the second largest school district.

Ron Prescott had a way of influencing you to do the right thing. When there were several attempts to break up the unified school district, it was Ron that saved our district.

When you needed to know the facts on funding for certain programs, it was Ron who was there with the facts.

He was never the kind to be obnoxious, but the kind that you could understand. He was always clear. He was always factual. He was always committed.

We have lost a great educator. We mourn his loss.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ERNEST WITHERS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, Memphis, Tennessee and the Nation lost a great photographer and a great public personage in Ernest Withers. Ernest Withers died at the age of 85. He was a gentleman who was at the right time at the right place with the camera that took the picture that showed the civil rights movement, showed the history of Memphis, Tennessee and its progress from segregation to integration to a city that's one of America's great cities today.

Mr. Withers was one of the first African Americans hired as a police officer in the city of Memphis in 1949. He left that profession and went into photography. And whenever there was an event, Mr. Withers was there. He took a picture of B.B. King and Elvis together on Beale Street. The King and the King together on Beale, back in about 1956, when B.B. was thin enough that you wouldn't recognize him, and Elvis was thin too.

He had pictures of Dr. King and the civil rights movement. He covered Oxford, Mississippi; he covered Medgar Evers. He covered all of the major civil rights events that came throughout the mid-South.

He was published in People Magazine and the New York Times, and Ebony and Jet, and was honored by the Memphis College of Art with an honorary degree in 1992, and by the Missouri School of Journalism for his great work in photography.

He'll be missed in Memphis, and his collection needs to be maintained and made available to all citizens for remembrance of what went on during the civil rights era. He'll be missed by all of us. He'll be remembered in history books and museums.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. Res. 106

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed from House Resolution 106 as a cosponsor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-65)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice to the *Federal Register* for publication, stating that the emergency declared with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia is to continue in effect beyond October 21, 2007.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on October 21, 1995, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The actions of significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States and to cause unparalleled violence, corruption, and harm in the United States and abroad. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain economic pressure on significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia by blocking their property and interests in property that are in the United States or within the possession or control of United States persons and by depriving them of access to the U.S. market and financial system.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 18, 2007.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1345

PREVENTABLE INFECTIONS OCCURRING IN HEALTH CARE SETTINGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the news headlines yesterday and today, we learned that more people die from an infection called MRSA than die from AIDS. The news, however, is much worse than this. And that is, if you look at the amount of preventable infections that occur in health care settings, it actually is more like 90,000 people die, will die this year from preventable infections in health care settings, and over 2 million cases will occur.

The cost to our health care system in America is over \$50 billion. As we look at the cost of health care and how families cannot afford it, it is important that this Chamber take into account what we can do to reduce costs and fix the system and not just finance the system. And this is one of those areas.

Now, recently, the Center for Medicare Services, CMS, also said that they would move towards not funding treatment of preventable infections in hospitals. Now, although that is an important move, and one that will save a great deal of money and one that we believe will help motivate health care centers to take more action, it still does not help with a couple of issues. One is that there's not a universal system across America where citizens can find out what are the infection rates within certain health care settings. And those are important because when one is selecting a hospital for care or going to a clinic, it would be good to know what those infection rates are.

You know, for example, it's mandated by law that airlines have to report their on-time rates for when they depart or arrive at the gates at an airport. However, you cannot find that information about the safety levels of the hospital which you may be going for treatment or surgery, and we need to make that available.

Nineteen different States require some level of this, but, quite frankly, it is a hodgepodge of different requirements. Some report to the Department of Health. Some report some diseases and not others. And we need to make this uniform across the Nation so that patients can tell and that it is an important aspect of helping people to understand before they go into a hospital.

Now, the thing about this is these infection rates are preventable. You have issues such as MRSA, methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus; pneumonias; urinary tract infections; and others that could be preventable by a couple of important procedures: washing hands; wearing gloves for procedures; sterilizing equipment; cleaning up before and after procedures, including patients' rooms and other areas;